

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
at CHATTANOOGA

ROBERT BROOKS,)
)
Plaintiff,) Case No. 1:14-cv-45
v.)
)
ARVIN REINGOLD, *et al.*,) Judge Mattice
) Magistrate Judge Carter
Defendants.)
)

ORDER

On February 14, 2014, United States Magistrate Judge William B. Carter filed a Report and Recommendation (Doc. 3) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). Magistrate Judge Carter recommended that this action be dismissed and the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* be denied as moot.

Plaintiff has filed no objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.¹ Nevertheless, the Court has reviewed *de novo* the record in this matter, and it agrees with the Magistrate Judge's well-reasoned conclusions.

Accordingly, the Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Carter's findings of fact and conclusions of law. This action is hereby **DISMISSED** and Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

¹ Magistrate Judge Carter specifically advised Plaintiff that he had 14 days in which to object to the Report and Recommendation and that failure to do so would waive his right to appeal. (Doc. 3); *see Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); see also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 148-51 (1985) (noting that “[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate's factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings”)).

SO ORDERED this 4th day of March, 2014.

/s/ Harry S. Mattice, Jr.
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE